UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/697,850	10/30/2003	Eric H. Baker	2500004-991101	9757

26379 7590 09/05/2007

DLA PIPER US LLP
2000 UNIVERSITY AVENUE
E. PALO ALTO, CA 94303-2248

EXAMINER	
BEEGLE, HEATHER L	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3609	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/05/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/697,850	BAKER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Heather Beegle	3609	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *10/30/2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-35* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-35* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *11/26/2003, 10/30/2003*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Status of the Application

1. Claims 1-35 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1, 6, 9, 12, 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Tam et al. [U.S. Pub No. 2002/0147656].

Regarding Claim 1, A system for providing logistics for a sale goods, the system being adapted to receive information from at least one remote seller and at least one remote buyer, and to provide financial logistics and shipping logistics for completing the sale of goods, wherein the financial logistics include collecting funds from the buyer and transferring at least a portion of the funds to a third party designated by the seller, without requiring interaction between the buyer and seller. **(Abstract)**

Regarding Claim 6, The system of claim 1 wherein the system is adapted to receive the information over a computer network. **(Abstract)**

Regarding Claim 9, The system of claim 1 wherein the system is adapted to provide the shipping logistics by use of at least one geography-based and time-based strategy. **(¶ 112)**

Regarding Claim 12, The system of claim 1 wherein the financial logistics include authorizing an amount of sale on a credit card of the buyer, charging the credit card for the amount of sale, receiving the amount of sale, and transferring at least a portion of the amount of sale to the third party. **(Abstract, Pg. 15, Col. 1, lines 5-7)**

Regarding Claim 13, A method for providing logistics for a sale of goods comprising the steps of:

- receiving information from a seller, including a description of certain goods, a method of sale for the certain goods, and an identity of a third party that will receive proceeds from the sale; **(Abstract)**
- presenting the description of the certain goods to a prospective buyer according to the method of sale; **(Abstract)**
- conducting the sale over a computer network; **(Abstract)**

- providing financial logistics, including collecting proceeds from the buyer and transferring at least a portion of the proceeds to the third party; **(Abstract)**
- providing shipping logistics, including arranging for transfer of the goods to the buyer. **(Abstract)**

4. Claims 21, 22, 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Salls [U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0152130].

Regarding Claim 21, A computerized method for conducting a raffle, comprising the steps of:

- receiving requests to purchase raffle tickets from a plurality of buyers over a computer network; **(Abstract)**
- receiving identification information from the plurality of buyers; **(Abstract)**
- creating a record of the plurality of buyers weighted according to the number of tickets purchased by each buyer; **(Fig. 8)**
- selecting a winner at random from the record; **(Abstract)**
- notifying the winner. **(Fig. 13)**

Regarding Claim 22, The method of claim 21 wherein the winner wins goods provided by a first party. **(Fig. 14)**

Regarding Claim 24, The method of claim 22 further comprising the steps of: receiving information from the first party, including the identity of a third party that will receive the proceeds of the raffle; and transferring proceeds from raffle tickets purchased to the third party. **(¶ 45)**

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 2-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tam et al. [U.S. Pub No. 2002/0147656].

Regarding Claims 2-4, Tam et al. fails to explicitly disclose third party comprising a charitable or nonprofit entity, political action committee, fundraising entity.

However, the difference between a third party as disclosed by Tam et al. and the named entities is only found in the non-functional descriptive material and is not functionally involved in the steps recited. Defining the third party would be performed the same regardless of whether the entity was charitable, political action committee or fundraising

entity. Limitations that are not functionally interrelated with the useful acts, structure, or properties of the claimed invention carry little or no patentable weight. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see In re Ngai, 70 USPQ2d 1862 (CAFC 2004); In re Gulack, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); In re Lowry, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to have different entities such as named above because the third party name does not functionally relate to the steps in the method claimed and because the subjective interpretation of the order does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention.

7. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tam et al. [U.S. Pub No. 2002/0147656] as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Maritzen et al. [U.S. Pat. No. 5,987,429].

Regarding Claim 5, Tam et al. discloses, The system of claim 2.

Regarding Claim 5, Tam et al. fails to explicitly disclose,

- wherein said financial logistics comprises providing said entity with information regarding the seller sufficient to allow the entity to generate an acknowledgement for tax reporting purposes.

Regarding Claim 5, Maritzen et al. discloses,

- wherein said financial logistics comprises providing said entity with information regarding the seller sufficient to allow the entity to generate an acknowledgement for tax reporting purposes. **(Fig. 2B, 6)**

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teachings of Maritzen et al. in the device of Tam et al., in order to calculate the appropriate fee since specific information about the transaction may change the fee. **(Abstract from Maritzen et al.)**

8. Claims 7, 10, 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tam et al. [U.S. Pub No. 2002/0147656] as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of Nakfoor [U.S. Pat. No. 6,496,809].

Regarding Claim 7, Tam et al. discloses, The system of claim 6.

Regarding Claim 7, Tam et al. fails to disclose,

- wherein the financial logistics comprises conducting an auction over the computer network.

Regarding Claim 7, Nakfoor discloses,

- wherein the financial logistics comprises conducting an auction over the computer network. **(Col. 4, lines 8-25)**

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teachings of Nakfoor in the device of Tam et al., in order to transfer the tickets and money in a timely manner since the worth of the tickets expire due to the event ending. **(Abstract from Nakfoor)**

Regarding Claim 10, Tam et al. discloses, The system of claim 9.

Regarding Claim 10, Tam et al. fails to disclose,

- wherein the goods are time-sensitive.

Regarding Claim 10, Nakfoor discloses,

- wherein the goods are time-sensitive. **(Fig. 4)**

Regarding Claim 11, Nakfoor further discloses, The system of claim 10

- wherein the goods are event tickets. **(Fig. 4)**

9. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tam et al. [U.S. Pub No. 2002/0147656] as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of Nakfoor [U.S. Pat. No. 6,496,809].

Regarding Claim 14, Tam et al. discloses, The method of claim 13.

Regarding Claim 14, Tam et al. fails to disclose,

- wherein the goods comprise event tickets.

Regarding Claim 14, Nakfoor discloses,

- wherein the goods comprise event tickets. **(Fig. 4)**

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teachings of Nakfoor in the device of Tam et al., in order to transfer the tickets and money in a timely manner since the worth of the tickets expire due to the event ending. **(Abstract from Nakfoor)**

10. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tam et al. [U.S. Pub No. 2002/0147656] as applied to claim 6 above, and further in view of Salls [U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0152130].

Regarding Claim 8, Tam et al. discloses, The system of claim 6.

Regarding Claim 8, Tam et al. fails to disclose,

- wherein the financial logistics comprises conducting a raffle over the computer network.

Regarding Claim 8, Salls discloses,

- wherein the financial logistics comprises conducting a raffle over the computer network. **(Abstract)**

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teachings of Salls in the device of Tam et al., in order to allow remote individuals to participate and allow the seller to obtain a predetermined amount based on the number of tickets sold. **(¶ 10-12 from Salls)**

11. Claims 15, 16, 17, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakfoor [U.S. Pat. No. 6,496,809] as applied to claim 14 above, and further in view of Tam et al. [U.S. Pub No. 2002/0147656].

Regarding Claims 15, 16, 17, Tam et al. fails to explicitly disclose third party comprising a charitable or nonprofit entity, political action committee, fundraising entity.

However, the difference between a third party as disclosed by Tam et al. and the named entities is only found in the non-functional descriptive material and is not functionally involved in the steps recited. Defining the third party would be performed the same regardless of whether the entity was charitable, political action committee or fundraising entity. Limitations that are not functionally interrelated with the useful acts, structure, or properties of the claimed invention carry little or no patentable weight. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see In re Ngai, 70 USPQ2d 1862 (CAFC 2004); In re Gulack, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); In re Lowry, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to have different entities such as named above because the third party name does not functionally relate to the steps in the method claimed and because

the subjective interpretation of the order does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention.

Regarding Claim 20, Nakfoor discloses, The method of claim 14.

Regarding Claim 20, Nakfoor fails to explicitly disclose,

- wherein said system is adapted to provide said shipping logistics by use of at least one geography-based and time-based strategy.

Regarding Claim 20, Tam et al. discloses,

- wherein said system is adapted to provide said shipping logistics by use of at least one geography-based and time-based strategy. **(¶ 112)**

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teachings of Tam et al. in the device of Nakfoor, in order to fulfill the order or purchase by using the most appropriate means based on customer geographic information since the tickets taught by Nakfoor are time sensitive **(Abstract, ¶ 111, 112 from Tam et al.)**

12. Claims 18, 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tam et al. [U.S. Pub No. 2002/0147656] as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of Maritzen et al. [U.S. Pat. No. 5,987,429].

Regarding Claim 18, Tam et al. discloses, The method of claim 15.

Regarding Claim 18, Tam et al. fails to disclose,

- providing the charitable or nonprofit entity with information regarding the seller sufficient to allow the entity to generate an acknowledgement for tax reporting purposes.

Regarding Claim 18, Maritzen et al. discloses,

- providing the charitable or nonprofit entity with information regarding the seller sufficient to allow the entity to generate an acknowledgement for tax reporting purposes. **(Fig. 2B, 6)**

Regarding Claim 19, Tam et al. discloses, The method of claim 15.

Regarding Claim 19, Tam et al. fails to disclose,

- causing an acknowledgement for tax reporting purposes to be provided to the seller.

Regarding Claim 19, Maritzen et al. discloses,

- causing an acknowledgement for tax reporting purposes to be provided to the seller. **(Fig. 2B, 6)**

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teachings of Maritzen et al. in the device of Tam et al., in order to calculate the appropriate fee since specific information about the transaction may change the fee. **(Abstract from Maritzen et al.)**

13. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Salls [U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0152130] as applied to claim 22 above, and further in view of Nakfoor [U.S. Pat. No. 6,496,809].

Regarding Claim 23, Salls discloses, The method of claim 22.

Regarding Claim 23, Salls fails to explicitly disclose,

- wherein the goods comprise event tickets

Regarding Claim 23, Nakfoor discloses,

- wherein the goods comprise event tickets. (Abstract)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teachings of Nakfoor in the device of Salls, in order to transfer the tickets and money in a timely manner since the worth of the tickets expire due to the event ending. **(Abstract from Nakfoor)**

14. Claims 25-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Salls [U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0152130].

Regarding Claims 25-27, Tam et al. fails to explicitly disclose third party comprising a charitable or nonprofit entity, political action committee, fundraising entity.

However, the difference between a third party as disclosed by Salls and the named entities is only found in the non-functional descriptive material and is not functionally involved in the steps recited. Defining the third party would be performed the same regardless of whether the entity was charitable, political action committee or fundraising entity. Limitations that are not functionally interrelated with the useful acts, structure, or properties of the claimed invention carry little or no patentable weight. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see In re Ngai, 70 USPQ2d 1862 (CAFC 2004); In re Gulack, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); In re Lowry, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to have different entities such as named above because the third party name does not functionally relate to the steps in the method claimed and because the subjective interpretation of the order does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention.

Regarding Claim 28, Salls further discloses, The method of claim 25, further comprising the step of:

- causing an acknowledgement for tax reporting purposes to be provided to the first party. **(¶ 6-8)**

Regarding Claim 29, Salls fails to explicitly disclose a spreadsheet.

However, the difference between database as disclosed by Salls and the spreadsheet is only found in the non-functional descriptive material and is not functionally involved in the steps recited. Defining the database would be performed the same regardless of whether the spreadsheet existed. Limitations that are not functionally interrelated with the useful acts, structure, or properties of the claimed invention carry little or no patentable weight. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see In re Ngai, 70 USPQ2d 1862 (CAFC 2004); In re Gulack, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); In re Lowry, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to create a spreadsheet from the database table or view the table because the database tables do not functionally relate to the steps in the method claimed and because the subjective interpretation of the order does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention.

Regarding Claim 30, Salls fails to explicitly disclose the method of determining the primary key.

However, the difference between primary key as disclosed by Salls and the row number in the spreadsheet is only found in the non-functional descriptive material and is not functionally involved in the steps recited. Defining the primary key would be performed the same regardless of whether the row number in the spreadsheet was generated by a formula. Limitations that are not functionally interrelated with the useful acts, structure, or properties of the claimed invention carry little or no patentable weight. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see In re Ngai, 70 USPQ2d 1862 (CAFC 2004); In re Gulack, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); In re Lowry, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to use a row number generated by a formula in a spreadsheet because the primary key does not functionally relate to the steps in the method claimed and because the subjective interpretation of the order does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention.

Regarding Claims 31, Salls fails to explicitly disclose random number as the row number in a spreadsheet.

However, the difference between random number as disclosed by Salls and the random number as a row number is only found in the non-functional descriptive material and is not functionally involved in the steps recited. Defining the random number would be performed the same regardless of whether the random number as a row number was used. Limitations that are not functionally interrelated with the useful acts, structure, or properties of the claimed invention carry little or no patentable weight. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see In re Ngai, 70 USPQ2d 1862 (CAFC 2004); In re Gulack, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); In re Lowry, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to random number as a row number because the random number does not functionally relate to the steps in the method claimed and because the subjective interpretation of the order does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention.

Regarding Claim 32, The method of claim 21 wherein the record is created by sequentially assigning numbers to the plurality of buyers based on the number of tickets purchased by each buyer, wherein a winner is selected by generating a random number

between one and the total number of tickets sold, and wherein the winner is the buyer corresponding to the random number.

Regarding Claim 32, Salls fails to explicitly disclose the random number being less than the number of tickets sold.

However, the difference between random number as disclosed by Salls and the random number equal to or less than the number of tickets sold is only found in the non-functional descriptive material and is not functionally involved in the steps recited. Defining the random number would be performed the same regardless of whether the the random number equal to or less than the number of tickets sold. Limitations that are not functionally interrelated with the useful acts, structure, or properties of the claimed invention carry little or no patentable weight. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see In re Ngai, 70 USPQ2d 1862 (CAFC 2004); In re Gulack, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); In re Lowry, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to generate the random number equal to or less than the number of tickets sold because the random number does not functionally relate to the steps in the

method claimed and because the subjective interpretation of the order does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention.

15. Claims 33-35 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Salls [U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0152130] as applied to claim 21 above, and further in view of Petras et al. [U.S. Pub. No. 2001/0047290].

Regarding Claim 33, Salls discloses, The method of claim 21.

Regarding Claim 33, Salls fails to explicitly disclose,

- wherein the winner is notified over the computer network.

Regarding Claim 33, Petras et al. discloses,

- wherein the winner is notified over the computer network. **(¶ 220)**

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teachings of Petras et al. in the device of Salls, in order to provide automatic notification since this be one of the effective methods in contacting the parties involved **(¶ 220 from Petras et al.)**.

Regarding Claim 34, Petras et al. further discloses, The method of claim 33

- wherein the winner is notified by automatically generating an email to the winner. **(¶ 220)**

Regarding Claim 35, The method of claim 33 wherein the winner is notified by automatically generating an instant message to the winner.

Regarding Claim 35, Petras et al. fails to explicitly disclose an instant message being sent.

However, the difference between an email being sent as disclosed by Petras et al. and the instant message is only found in the non-functional descriptive material and is not functionally involved in the steps recited. Defining the electronic message sent would be performed the same regardless of whether the instant message was used. Limitations that are not functionally interrelated with the useful acts, structure, or properties of the claimed invention carry little or no patentable weight. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see In re Ngai, 70 USPQ2d 1862 (CAFC 2004); In re Gulack, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); In re Lowry, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to send an instant message because the generating of an electronic message such as an email does not functionally relate to the steps in the method claimed and because the subjective interpretation of the order does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Heather Beegle whose telephone number is (571) 270-3333. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday Thru Thursday, 7:30 am to 5:00 pm eastern.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Akm Ullah can be reached on (571) 272-2361. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

HB

AKM ULLAH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER